

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to all the points of rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action dated February 11, 2003, in the above-identified application.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-11 will be all the claims presently under examination. Claims 1 and 8 will have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

RESPONSE TO §112 REJECTIONS:

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, claim 1, lines 8-9 and claim 8, lines 12-13, recite “the central axis so as to create different angular offset and light intensities between two zones,” which Examiner regards as indefinite and vague. Accordingly, Applicants have herein amended claims 1 and 8 to overcome the Examiner’s rejection. Additionally, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Specifically, claims 1 and 8 recited “at least two zones of different maximum light intensities,” which the Examiner believed was not supported by the specification. Accordingly, Applicants have herein amended claims 1 and 8 to overcome the Examiner’s rejection.

RESPONSE TO DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTIONS:

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,409,369 to De

Lamberterie. Accordingly, Applicants are submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer, which is believed to be sufficient to overcome the Examiner's doubling patenting rejection without further comment.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) as being unpatentable over De Lamberterie. Accordingly, Applicants herewith file a Declaration Under 37 CFR §1.132, which should be sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejection without further comment.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Staiger. More specifically, the Examiner believes that Staiger discloses each element recited in claims 1-11. However, Applicants maintain that Staiger fails to disclose two distinct zones of maximum light intensities as recited in amended claims 1 and 8.

Staiger is directed to a method for producing a reflective surface for distributing light from a light source according to a desired light pattern for application with a vehicle headlight. In Staiger, the reflector is asymmetrical so that the light is reflected by the reflector so as to distribute light on a surface to be illuminated. The light is distributed according to the brightness so that "an undesired brightness increase or decrease is avoided." (see col. 4, lines 41-57). Staiger suggests using the available light to illuminate the surface uniformly. To this end, Staiger clearly avoids creation of distinct zones of maximum light intensities.

Finally, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Jiao. Accordingly, Applicants have herein amended claims 1 and 8 to further distinguishing over Jiao. More specifically, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to more particularly point out that the reflective surface is continuous, which is a feature not believed to be disclosed by Jiao.

Jiao is directed to a reflector for a headlamp that is divided into zones depending on the sizes of light source images produced by the various parts of the reflector. The light source images are produced by plurality of facets on the surface of reflector. Thus, the reflective surface in Jiao is produced using non-continuous reflective elements. Conversely, in the present invention, the reflector is comprised of a reflective surface that is continuous with different reflective zones. Therefore, claims 1 and 8 are believed to be distinguishable over Jiao at least for this reason. Likewise, claims 2-7 and 9-11 are also distinguishable over Jiao based on their dependency from claims 1 and 8, respectively.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and are now in condition for allowance.

AUTHORIZATIONS

Two checks for \$930.00 and \$110.00 are enclosed to cover the fees for the three-month extension of time and filing of a Terminal Disclaimer. The Commissioner is also hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this filing to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4706. Likewise, any overpayment is credited to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4706.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Date: 07/25/03

By: Mark D. Pratt
Mark D. Pratt
Reg. No.: 45,794
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
Morgan & Finnegan, LLP
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154